Waking from our symbolic dream

Benjamin James

January 2, 2026

There is a familiar but rarely articulated sensation that accompanies much of contemporary thought. A feeling that our concepts, identities, and explanations are almost right, yet somehow off by a small but persistent margin. We recognize ourselves in the stories we tell about who we are and what the world is like, but not without friction. Something catches and resists. Our language fits well enough to function, but not well enough to settle. This sensation is often dismissed as confusion, personal uncertainty, or intellectual failure; however, it appears with too much regularity, across too many domains of life, to be reduced to individual error. It surfaces in philosophical debate, political discourse, scientific explanation, and private reflection alike. We sense that we understand, and simultaneously that we do not quite understand what we think we understand.

This feeling should not be treated as a problem to be solved or an obstacle to be overcome. It is a structural condition. To be conscious is not to stand outside reality and look in upon it with a neutral gaze. It is to be embedded within reality as a localized process, subject to its constraints, partial in access, and forced to operate without the luxury of total perspective. The slight misalignment we experience between our symbols and the world is not a sign that our cognition has gone wrong. It is evidence that our cognition is doing exactly what it must do under conditions of finitude.

The repeated intuition of half-waking arises because symbolic cognition places us in a peculiar position. We are not merely reacting to stimuli, nor are we in possession of a comprehensive model of the systems we inhabit. Instead, we navigate through layers of representation, our concepts, narratives, categories, and identities, that allow us to act, coordinate, and survive without requiring full knowledge. These symbolic structures give us orientation, but they also obscure the fact that they are doing so. They encourage us to treat the world as something we are describing, rather than something we are participating in.

When that participation becomes more visible, when our explanations strain, outcomes surprise us, or certainty erodes, the sensation of half-waking emerges.

The central hypothesis guiding this inquiry is simple, but its implications are not. We are not detached observers attempting to represent reality from a distance. We are localized processes within reality, attempting to orient ourselves through symbolic scaffolding that is necessarily incomplete. Symbols are not mirrors held up to the world; they are tools reality uses, through us, to remain navigable from within. They allow partial systems to function without requiring impossible levels of access. At the same time, they invite misunderstanding when we forget the conditions under which they arise.

My aim is not to unveil a hidden metaphysical truth, nor to offer a superior description of what reality "really is." It is more modest, and in some ways more demanding. The task is to understand why symbolic cognition exists at all, why it so reliably oscillates between insight and distortion, and how it might be engaged with less friction, less violence toward experience, less rigidity toward difference, and less insistence that the world conform to our preferred descriptions. If there is an ethical dimension here, it lies not in revelation but in restraint, and in learning to inhabit our symbols without mistaking them for the ground they stand upon.

This is not a call to abandon concepts, language, or identity. Such calls are themselves symbolic fantasies, imagining a return to immediacy that no reflective system can sustain. Rather, it is an invitation to take seriously the possibility that the discomfort we feel in our thought, the sense of being almost awake, may be the most reliable indicator that our cognitive situation is being perceived honestly. To begin from that honesty is to relinquish hope of final clarity, but also to open the possibility of a more careful, less adversarial relationship with meaning itself.

Much of Western philosophy, alongside the sciences it has helped to shape, proceeds from a largely unexamined assumption that symbols are representations whose primary function is to mirror reality as accurately as possible. Words, concepts, equations, and models are evaluated according to how well they correspond to the world they purport to describe. When disagreement persists, the presumption is that one description must be closer to "the

truth" than another, and that sufficient refinement with better data, clearer definitions, and more rigorous logic will eventually resolve the mismatch. This assumption is so deeply embedded in our intellectual practice that it often escapes notice, appearing instead as common sense.

However, our experience of persistent disagreement should give us pause. Across domains, we encounter disputes that are not merely empirical but conceptual and resistant to resolution despite good faith, intelligence, and shared evidence. Philosophical arguments recur across centuries without convergence, while political debates circle endlessly around the same contested terms. Even in the sciences, theoretical frameworks proliferate where unification was once expected. At a personal level, we struggle to articulate experiences that feel deeply real but stubbornly resistant to language. The result is a widespread sense that language fails at depth, and that our most important experiences outrun the symbols meant to contain them.

If symbols were truly mirrors, this pattern would be puzzling. Persistent failure would suggest either profound human incompetence or an inexplicably elusive reality. Our frustration is too systematic, too predictable, to be accidental. The problem lies not in our insufficient cleverness, but in the assumption that mirroring is what symbols are for in the first place. Treating symbols as mirrors sets them on an impossible task to capture, without remainder, a world that is not only complex but that includes the very symbol-making activity itself.

An alternative framing begins by recognizing symbols as operational compressions rather than representations. A compression is not a miniature copy of what it compresses; it is a selective reduction designed to preserve certain features at the expense of others. Maps do not fail because they omit details; they succeed because they do. Omission is not a flaw but a condition of usability. Likewise, symbolic systems reduce the dimensionality of experience so that action becomes possible under constraint. They highlight what matters for a given purpose and ignore what does not, all while remaining vulnerable to shifts in context that alter what "matters" means.

The loss inherent in symbolic representation is not an error to be corrected but a design feature. Compression implies sacrifice by necessity. No symbol can carry the full richness

of what it stands for, because doing so would defeat its function. Language simplifies sensation, categories flatten variation, and narratives impose linearity on processes that unfold across multiple scales. When these simplifications work, they do so quietly, inviting us to forget that they are simplifications at all. When they stop working, we experience not the normal limits of compression, but a crisis of meaning.

This helps explain why disagreement is not merely stubbornness, ignorance, or bad faith. Different symbolic compressions preserve different features, depending on context, history, and purpose. When participants in a dispute treat their symbols as mirrors rather than tools, their disagreement becomes moralized. To reject a symbol is no longer to question its usefulness, but to deny reality itself. Their conversation hardens and positions ossify. The possibility that multiple compressions might be locally viable but globally incompatible is rarely entertained, because doing so would require relinquishing our fantasy of a single, final representation.

Our attachment to symbolic certainty is not merely intellectual; it is existential. Symbols stabilize identity. They allow us to locate ourselves in a world that would otherwise overwhelm us with complexity. To question their mirroring capacity is therefore to introduce a form of vulnerability. If symbols do not tell us how things really are, then what anchors belief, action, or responsibility? Our temptation is to retreat from this question, defend representational certainty at all costs, and treat ambiguity as a defect rather than an invitation to revise our expectations of what understanding can look like.

The suggestion here is not that symbols are arbitrary or that “anything goes.” Compression is constrained by reality. A map that ignores rivers will not help one cross a landscape, and a concept that consistently fails to guide action will be abandoned, whether consciously or not. However, constraint does not imply completeness. Symbols succeed when they are good enough to navigate a situation, not when they exhaust its meaning. When we ask of them more than this, when we demand that they mirror reality rather than mediate our engagement with it, we set ourselves up for disappointment.

To recognize symbols as operational compressions is therefore to accept a more modest, and perhaps more humane, vision of cognition. Understanding becomes less about

possessing correct representations and more about maintaining workable relations. Truth shifts from static correspondence to dynamic fit. The discomfort this introduces is real, but it is also clarifying. It suggests that our sense of half-waking with which we began is not a sign that thought is failing, but that it is brushing up against the limits of what symbols can reasonably be asked to do. To remain attentive to that limit, rather than attempting to abolish it, may be the first step toward thinking with less friction and greater care.

Any system that exists within a larger system must, by necessity, operate under conditions of partial access. This is not a contingent limitation imposed by ignorance or poor design; it is a structural fact about embeddedness. A subsystem cannot survey the whole of which it is a part without ceasing to be a subsystem. It occupies a position, not a vantage point. Its access is constrained by boundaries of scale, location, and time, and whatever orientation it achieves must be accomplished from within those constraints rather than by transcending them. This fact is so basic that it is often overlooked, yet it quietly governs every attempt at understanding we make.

Human cognition is no exception. It is finite in capacity, local in perspective, and temporally constrained in operation. We encounter the world from somewhere, not everywhere; now, not always; with limited memory, not exhaustive recall. Our senses register only narrow bands of possible signals, our attention filters aggressively, and our interpretive frameworks prioritize continuity over completeness. None of this is accidental. It is what makes action possible. A mind that attempted to register everything would not be more accurate; it would be incapacitated. Partial access is not a defect of cognition but the condition of its viability.

Once this is taken seriously, symbolic cognition begins to look less like a failed attempt at omniscience and more like an adaptive response to impossibility. Symbols arise because total access is unavailable. They allow a finite system to operate as though it had a grasp on a world that exceeds it, not by representing that world exhaustively, but by carving out actionable regularities. Concepts, categories, and narratives compress vast fields of potential information into manageable forms, enabling coordination, prediction, and memory without demanding an impossible synoptic view.

This dissolves a longstanding philosophical tension. On one side lies naïve realism, the assumption that we have, or could have, direct and unmediated access to reality as it is. On the other lies radical skepticism, the claim that because our access is mediated and partial, we have no genuine access at all. Both positions accept the same mistaken premise that knowledge must either be total or illusory. If we cannot see everything, the skeptic concludes, then we see nothing of what matters. If we can see something, the realist insists, then what we see must correspond directly to the world as such.

The alternative is less dramatic and more plausible. It is the recognition of situated access under constraint. We do not see everything, but we do see something, and what we see is shaped by where and how we are positioned within the system. Our access is neither absolute nor void. It is partial, structured, and responsive to constraint. We learn not by escaping our embeddedness, but by negotiating with it and adjusting our compressions in response to feedback from the world we are already in contact with.

Cognition is better understood as navigation rather than depiction. A navigator does not require a perfect representation of the terrain; they require a workable sense of where they are, where obstacles lie, and how movement alters position. Maps are judged by whether they help one move without collision, not by whether they capture every feature of the landscape. Similarly, cognitive symbols function insofar as they allow a system to orient itself within reality, to move, adjust, and recalibrate without catastrophic error.

This suggests that understanding is not static possession but a dynamic process. Symbols are not endpoints but instruments, continually tested against constraint. When they fail, their failure does not imply that reality has become unknowable, but that the current compression no longer fits the situation. Learning, then, is not the accumulation of more accurate mirrors, but the refinement of navigational tools that are always provisional because the system they navigate is not fixed.

To accept reality under partial access is therefore to abandon the hope of final representation, but it is also to gain something more durable. It allows us to treat error as information rather than catastrophe, disagreement as a sign of differing positions rather than of universal confusion, and uncertainty as a normal feature of embedded cognition rather

than as an existential threat. In doing so, it prepares the ground for a more compassionate account of symbolic life; one that acknowledges limitation without collapsing into despair, and constraint without mistaking it for imprisonment.

The metaphor of the “symbolic dream” can now be introduced with greater care, precisely because it is so easily misunderstood. To speak of a dream is often to imply illusion, falsity, or delusion; a departure from reality that must be corrected by waking. That is not the sense intended here. The symbolic dream does not name a state of being wrong about the world, nor does it imply that our everyday experience is a hallucination from which we must escape. It names a more subtle and pervasive condition; the tendency of symbolic systems to forget that they are compressions, and to treat their outputs as though they were the thing compressed.

In this sense, the symbolic dream is not an error but a stance. It is the condition of operating through symbols that have become transparent to their users. When a compression works reliably, its simplifying function recedes from awareness. The map feels like the territory, the category feels like the object, and the narrative feels like the sequence of events themselves. This transparency is not accidental. It is what allows symbols to stabilize action. If one were constantly aware of the provisionality and incompleteness of every concept, decisive movement would become difficult, if not impossible. Forgetting the compression is, in this respect, a functional necessity.

The symbolic dream, then, consists in mistaking operational success for ontological adequacy. Because a symbol works well enough to guide behavior, it is assumed to capture reality as such. Over time, this assumption hardens. Symbols accumulate affective and moral weight, while they become tied to identity, belonging, and competence. To question them no longer feels like a technical adjustment but like a threat to oneself. At this stage, the dream deepens, not because our symbols have become false, but because their provisional nature has been obscured by their utility.

This forgetting has clear benefits. It allows for coordination across individuals and generations. It supports institutions, norms, and practices that depend on shared expectations. It reduces cognitive load by limiting the range of possibilities that must be

considered at any given moment. A society that constantly treated its symbols as tentative hypotheses would struggle to act. Stability requires a degree of symbolic sleep, and a willingness to proceed as though the categories in use were adequate until proven otherwise.

At the same time, the narrowing of perception that accompanies this forgetting is unavoidable. Symbols that stabilize action also filter experience. They foreground certain features of reality while backgrounding others. Over time, what is consistently ignored becomes increasingly difficult to notice at all. The symbolic dream thus produces a form of blindness that is not the result of ignorance, but of habituation. We stop seeing what our symbols do not invite us to see, and we interpret the absence of perception as the absence of phenomenon.

It is tempting to frame symbolic sleep as a failure of courage or imagination, but such judgments miss the structural trade-off involved. To function is to compress, to compress is to exclude, and to exclude is to risk mistaking the exclusion for inexistence. No individual or culture escapes this logic entirely. The question is not whether we dream symbolically, but how rigidly we cling to our dream when it begins to strain.

Reconsidering the symbolic dream in this way allows us to reinterpret moments of disorientation. When symbols begin to fail, when our categories feel inadequate, narratives fracture, or language seems to fall short, it is easy to conclude that something has gone wrong with thought itself. Such moments may instead mark points where the cost of forgetting compression becomes visible. The dream does not collapse because it was false; it loosens because the environment has changed in ways our existing symbols can no longer comfortably carry.

Waking, in this context, is not the abandonment of symbols, nor the achievement of unmediated access to reality. It is the partial recovery of awareness that one is dreaming symbolically at all. This awareness need not be permanent to be valuable. Indeed, it cannot be. Action requires re-entry into the dream, a renewed willingness to treat provisional tools as temporarily sufficient. The alternative is paralysis. Our task is therefore not to stay awake

in some absolute sense, but to learn how to wake and sleep without mistaking either state for the whole of cognition.

Maintaining this balance demands a gentler posture toward understanding. It invites us to see symbolic certainty not as a virtue, but as a temporary stance whose usefulness depends on context. It encourages patience with others whose compressions differ, recognizing that divergence often reflects different positions within the same system rather than errors of perception, and it reframes the discomfort of conceptual strain as an opportunity for revision rather than as a sign of collapse.

Our symbolic dream is not something to be shattered. It is something to be handled with care. It is the price we pay for being finite systems trying to orient ourselves within a reality that exceeds us. To forget this price entirely is to risk rigidity. To remember it too vividly is to risk inaction. Between these extremes lies a more workable path; one in which symbols are allowed to function, fail, and be revised without being asked to bear the impossible burden of finality.

Communication is most often framed as a technical problem of how to transmit information accurately, how to persuade effectively, or how to arrive at shared agreement. These framings dominate philosophy of language, political theory, and everyday discourse alike. They presume that there is something stable, a truth, belief, or preference, that exists prior to communication and that communication's task is to move that something intact from one mind to another. When communication fails, explanation is typically sought in noise, distortion, bias, or bad faith. What goes wrong, we are told, is the channel.

I propose a different starting point. Communication is not, at its core, the transmission of truth, nor the optimization of persuasion, nor the construction of consensus. It is an intra-system signaling process by which reality, operating through distributed and partially informed subsystems, attempts to coordinate itself without any node having access to the whole. Communication is not something added on top of cognition; it is one of the primary ways cognition compensates for its locality.

Each mind encounters reality from a position that is irreducibly its own. This encounter is shaped by bodily constraints, social location, temporal circumstance, and historical

contingency. No two encounters are identical, and none are fully shareable. Even when individuals occupy similar environments, what they register, attend to, and integrate differs in ways that cannot be perfectly reconciled. Communication arises not because these differences can be eliminated, but because they cannot. It is the attempt to translate a local encounter with constraint into a form that might be usable by another subsystem navigating a different slice of the same world.

Seen this way, communication is an act of exposure rather than delivery. To speak, write, or gesture is to take something that has been encountered privately, such as an insight, pattern, tension, or limit, and compress it into a symbolic form that others may or may not be able to follow. The form is necessarily lossy. It cannot reproduce the original encounter, because the encounter was never an object that could be extracted from its context. At best, the symbol can function as a marker, indicating that "something like this was here," and offering a possible route by which another might arrive at a similar constraint through their own means.

There is a quiet loneliness in this process that is often overlooked. Each cognitive system is alone with the particular configuration of reality it encounters. No amount of communication dissolves that solitude completely. Symbols do not eliminate isolation; they acknowledge it and work around it. To communicate is to accept that one cannot hand over experience itself, only a pointer toward where experience pressed back. In this sense, communication is not primarily about being understood. It is about leaving evidence that understanding was attempted.

At the same time, there is generosity in this act that should not be understated. To compress an encounter into symbols is to do work on behalf of others. It is to assume that one's local friction might be relevant beyond oneself, that the constraint one hit may be encountered again from another angle, and that leaving a trace could reduce the cost of that future encounter. Even when communication fails in the narrow sense, when disagreement persists and misunderstanding proliferates, it may succeed in this deeper function by enriching the system's repertoire of return paths.

The idea of symbols as return paths clarifies their role. A return path does not lead back to an origin in any absolute sense. There is no pristine starting point to which cognition can

return. Instead, a return path leads back to a constraint, difficulty, or structural feature of reality that can be encountered from multiple directions. Symbols are not blueprints for replication but guides for re-encounter. They do not tell others what to see; they suggest where pressure was felt.

This reframing helps explain why communication often feels unsatisfying when judged by the standards of persuasion or consensus. If the aim is agreement, then divergence appears as failure, but if the aim is coordination under partial access, divergence is expected. Different subsystems will approach the same constraint from different trajectories, and the symbols they generate will reflect those paths. Communication does not erase these differences; it allows them to coexist without requiring collapse into uniformity.

Understanding communication in this way grounds a form of compassion that does not rely on sentimentality. Others are not wrong simply because their symbols do not match ours. They may be responding to different constraints, or to the same constraints from different positions. Disagreement need not imply ignorance or malice. It often signals that reality is being approached from multiple angles simultaneously. Communication becomes less about winning and more about mapping the space of possible approaches.

This orientation does not eliminate conflict, nor does it promise harmony. It does, however, change the moral tone of interaction. To speak is no longer to assert dominance over meaning, but to offer a path that may or may not be taken. To listen is no longer to submit to persuasion, but to consider whether another's trace leads somewhere one has not yet gone. In this way, communication becomes one of the primary mechanisms by which reality, fragmented into finite perspectives, attempts to reduce its own internal friction. Not by enforcing agreement, but by proliferating routes of return.

If communication is an attempt to leave return paths, it is unsurprising that understanding feels difficult to hold. Insight often arrives with a sense of clarity that seems decisive, even liberating, only to fade, distort, or lose its force as circumstances change. This fragility is frequently interpreted as personal weakness or intellectual inconsistency, as though a more disciplined mind could simply retain understanding once achieved. The instability of insight

is not an individual failure. It is a structural feature of symbolic cognition operating under constraint.

One reason understanding degrades is that symbols themselves degrade. They are sensitive to context, dependent on background assumptions, and shaped by the conditions under which they were formed. When context shifts, socially, emotionally, or temporally, the same symbol may no longer point to the same constraint. What once functioned as a useful compression becomes misleading or inert. This is not because the symbol was false, but because its domain of applicability has changed. Insight that was locally valid loses traction when the environment no longer supplies the conditions that made it salient.

Another reason is that identity reasserts itself. Symbols do not float freely; they are embedded in narratives about who we are, what we value, and how we relate to others. Moments of insight often loosen these narratives, revealing their contingency, but identity is itself a compression mechanism. It returns because action requires it. To move, decide, and commit, the system must re-stabilize a sense of self. In doing so, it often pulls symbols back into alignment with familiar roles and expectations, blunting their disruptive edge.

This dynamic explains why “waking up” cannot be permanent. The language of awakening suggests a one-time transition from illusion to truth, from sleep to clarity. Such a transition is incompatible with the requirements of finite systems. Action demands re-compression, and orientation requires simplification. A mind that remained fully aware of the provisionality and partiality of all its symbols would struggle to act at all. Our return to symbolic sleep is not a regression; it is a necessity.

The fantasy of final enlightenment persists because it promises an end to this oscillation. It offers the hope that one might arrive at a vantage point from which reality is seen whole, and from which misunderstanding, conflict, and doubt dissolve. This hope is understandable, especially in a world saturated with symbolic strain, but it is also misleading. Any state of understanding that could be held permanently would, by definition, be a compression stable enough to function across contexts. Such stability would require the exclusion of precisely the variability and openness that insight often reveals.

A more realistic account treats awakening as iterative, local, and reversible. Insight occurs in response to specific pressures, within particular contexts, and for limited durations. It alters orientation temporarily, opening new possibilities for action and interpretation. Over time, these possibilities may be integrated into revised compressions, changing how the system operates going forward, but the moment of openness itself cannot be sustained indefinitely. It gives way to new routines, new symbols, and new identities, each carrying its own blind spots.

This relinquishes the promise of permanent clarity, but in doing so it relieves us of an impossible demand. If understanding is fragile, it is because it is alive. It responds to changing conditions, adapts to new constraints, and remains vulnerable to revision. The alternative, a frozen understanding immune to degradation, would be brittle, incapable of learning, and ultimately detached from the reality it seeks to navigate.

Recognizing this fragility can foster a different kind of patience. Instead of treating the loss of insight as failure, we can see it as part of a cycle in which symbols are formed, tested, worn down, and replaced. Memory becomes less about preserving exact formulations and more about retaining sensitivity to where friction tends to arise. Learning becomes less about accumulating answers and more about refining our ability to re-orient when old answers no longer work.

In this light, our experience of half-waking returns with new significance. It is not a deficiency to be overcome, but a signal that our cognition is operating near the edge of its compressive capacity. To live with that signal, to neither suppress it nor idolize it, is to accept the conditions of being a finite system within a reality that cannot be fully grasped from any single point. The disappointment of this acceptance is real, but so is its quiet relief.

If symbolic cognition is navigational rather than representational, then the criteria by which we evaluate understanding must shift accordingly. Instead of asking whether a symbol corresponds perfectly to reality, a question that presupposes access to a standpoint no embedded system can occupy, we can ask a different, more operational question. *What kind of friction does this symbol generate when it is used?* Friction, in this sense, becomes a

unifying analytic concept, one that cuts across cognitive, social, and ethical domains without collapsing them into one another.

Cognitive friction appears when a symbol consistently fails to guide thought or action without strain. It manifests as confusion, overload, compulsive rationalization, or the repeated need to patch explanations that no longer cohere. The mind feels effortful in the wrong places, and attention is spent defending a framework rather than engaging with the world around oneself. Importantly, cognitive friction is not simply difficulty; learning itself is often difficult. The difference lies in whether difficulty yields orientation or merely exhausts it. Symbols that reduce cognitive friction allow thought to move, adjust, and recover. Symbols that increase it trap thought in loops of justification.

Social friction arises when symbolic frameworks collide in shared spaces. Disagreement, by itself, is not evidence of dysfunction; it is a predictable consequence of partial access distributed across different positions. Social friction becomes diagnostic when interaction repeatedly generates misunderstanding, resentment, or escalation without producing new avenues of coordination. In such cases, the problem is rarely that one side lacks the correct representation of reality. More often, it is that the symbolic compressions in play are optimized for incompatible constraints, and that participants treat those compressions as non-negotiable. Friction accumulates not because reality is absent, but because too many rigid maps are being used simultaneously.

Ethical friction appears when principles that once oriented action begin to generate harm, guilt, or paralysis when applied outside the contexts that gave rise to them. Moral frameworks, like cognitive ones, are compressions. They simplify complex fields of consequence into actionable norms. When they function well, they reduce ethical friction by clarifying responsibility and guiding care. When they overextend, they produce moral residue, creating situations in which any available action feels wrong, or in which adherence to principle conflicts with the realities of lived constraint. Ethical friction signals not moral failure, but the need for recalibration.

Taken together, these forms of friction offer a different way of thinking about truth. Truth is less about abstract correspondence and more about ease of navigation under constraint. A

symbol is not evaluated by whether it captures reality exhaustively, but by whether it enables movement without unnecessary collision. This does not mean that any symbol that “feels good” counts as true. Friction is not mere discomfort. It is resistance encountered when symbols are put to work in the world. A symbol that reduces friction does so by aligning, however imperfectly, with the constraints it must negotiate.

This reframing avoids the familiar stalemate between relativism and absolutism. Against absolutism, it rejects the idea that there is a single, final symbolic description to which all others must conform. Embedded systems cannot access such a description, and pretending otherwise only increases friction. Against relativism, it rejects the notion that symbols are interchangeable or immune to evaluation. Some compressions are more viable than others, not because they are metaphysically privileged, but because they allow systems to function with less damage and greater adaptability.

Evaluating symbols by friction also introduces an ethical dimension into epistemology without moralizing it. Knowledge is no longer a matter of conquest, imposing one’s framework on reality or on others, but of care. To care is to attend to the costs our symbols impose on our own cognition, on our relationships, and on the environments we inhabit. A symbol that secures internal certainty at the expense of widespread harm is not epistemically neutral; it is friction-intensive. Likewise, a symbol that destabilizes identity but opens new possibilities for coordination may be worth the temporary discomfort it generates.

This shift subtly alters what counts as intellectual responsibility. Rather than defending symbols as if they were possessions, we become responsible for monitoring their effects. When friction rises, the appropriate response is not to double down, but to ask what constraint the symbol is failing to register. In this way, epistemology becomes less adversarial and more responsive. Understanding is no longer something to be won, but something to be maintained through ongoing adjustment.

The emphasis on friction also reframes error. Error is not the opposite of truth; it is a signal that navigation has become costly. To err is to discover where a compression no longer fits. When treated as information rather than as shame, error becomes one of the primary

mechanisms by which symbols are refined. This perspective does not celebrate failure, but it refuses to treat it as a moral indictment. The goal is not to eliminate friction entirely, a world without friction would be uninhabitable, but to distinguish productive resistance from destructive strain.

By foregrounding friction, we gain a diagnostic tool that respects the limits of symbolic cognition while remaining anchored to reality. We do not need to know what reality is "in itself" to notice when our ways of engaging with it are generating unnecessary damage. We only need to pay attention to where movement becomes painful, where coordination breaks down, and where care is compromised. In doing so, epistemology begins to align not with domination, but with stewardship, the careful use of symbols in a world that cannot afford our indifference.

Any framework that reconceives truth, understanding, and communication inevitably raises ethical questions. If symbols are compressions, if understanding is partial and provisional, and if disagreement reflects structural differences rather than simple error, then how are we to relate to one another responsibly? The temptation is to slide into thin compassion that dissolves judgment entirely, treating all positions as equally valid and all actions as beyond critique. This essay argues for something more demanding; compassion without illusion.

The first illusion this framework undermines is moral superiority. When we recognize that our symbols are shaped by specific constraints, histories, and positions within reality, it becomes difficult to sustain the fantasy that our perspective occupies a privileged moral height. Insight appears not as personal achievement but as situational alignment. What we see clearly now may be obscure to others not because they are deficient, but because they are oriented differently. This recognition does not excuse harm, but it complicates the story we tell about its origins.

At the same time, this framework resists the opposite illusion, that withholding judgment is the same as understanding. Compassion here is not tolerance-through-indifference, a posture that avoids engagement by flattening difference. It is understanding-through-structure. To understand another is not merely to feel sympathy for them, but to grasp the compressions under which they are operating, the constraints they are navigating, and the

pressures shaping their choices. This kind of understanding requires effort. It does not always feel kind, because it refuses easy absolution.

Others are not “asleep” in a pejorative sense. They are not trapped in illusion while we stand awake. They are operating under different symbolic economies, formed by different encounters with reality. Some of those economies may generate significant harm. Recognizing their structural origins does not neutralize that harm, but it does alter how responsibility is assigned. Blame becomes less about condemning defective individuals and more about addressing the symbolic configurations that reliably produce damage.

Responsibility becomes relational rather than authoritarian. It is no longer a matter of enforcing compliance with a supposedly universal norm, but of negotiating the shared spaces where different compressions interact. This negotiation requires boundaries. Compassion does not mean permitting everything. It means setting limits with awareness of what those limits are responding to. When harm occurs, the question shifts from “who is evil?” to “what configuration made this outcome likely, and how can it be altered?”

This relational view of responsibility also applies inward. Moral superiority often functions as a defense against recognizing one’s own symbolic overfit. By treating others as uniquely misguided, we protect our frameworks from scrutiny. Compassion without illusion turns that scrutiny back on the self, not in a spirit of self-flagellation, but of accountability. If our symbols reduce friction for us while increasing it for others, that asymmetry is ethically relevant. Care requires that we notice it.

Importantly, this approach does not dissolve agency into structure. Individuals still act. Choices still matter. But actions are understood as emerging from positions within systems rather than from unconditioned wills. Holding someone responsible, then, involves responding to their actions in ways that alter future possibilities, not merely expressing moral outrage. Consequences become tools for recalibration rather than instruments of humiliation.

This perspective can feel unsettling because it refuses the comfort of simple narratives. There are no clear heroes who see reality as it is, and no villains who stand outside it. There

are only finite systems attempting to navigate complexity with imperfect tools. Compassion arises not from pretending otherwise, but from acknowledging the cost of that navigation.

The ethical demand that follows is subtle but significant. It asks us to care not only about what symbols mean, but about what they do. It asks us to attend to the friction they generate, especially when that friction is borne by those with less capacity to absorb it. It asks us to revise our frameworks not only when they fail us, but when they succeed at the expense of others.

Such compassion does not guarantee agreement, nor does it promise peace. It does, however, offer a way to remain engaged without resorting to domination or withdrawal. By grounding ethics in structure rather than purity, it preserves the possibility of critique without collapsing into contempt. Responsibility becomes a shared, ongoing task; the work of adjusting our symbolic tools so that living together in a reality we only partially grasp becomes, if not easy, at least less needlessly painful.

If there is a practical orientation that emerges from this essay, it is a surprisingly modest one. The aim is not to escape symbols, dismantle language, or inhabit some purified state of unmediated contact with reality. Such aims are themselves symbolic fantasies, born of frustration with the limits of cognition and sustained by the hope that those limits might be transcended. The alternative proposed here is quieter and more demanding; to learn how to use symbols lightly. Lightness, in this sense, does not mean carelessness or detachment. It means holding symbols without mistaking them for what they are meant to serve.

To use symbols lightly is to recognize them as tools rather than as foundations. Tools can be effective without being sacred, and they can be relied upon without being defended at all costs. This posture allows symbols to do their work of orienting action, enabling coordination, and preserving memory while remaining available for revision when their costs become visible. Lightness resists the reflex to turn symbolic failure into existential threat. It makes room for adjustment without drama.

Gentleness is central to this orientation, and it operates along three axes. First, gentleness toward oneself. Much of our anxiety surrounding understanding arises from an implicit demand for coherence without remainder. We expect our beliefs to line up, our identities to

be stable, and our explanations to hold across contexts. When they do not, we interpret this discrepancy as personal inadequacy. Learning to wake gently involves relinquishing this demand. It allows us to acknowledge confusion without shame, notice contradiction without rushing to resolve it, and let insight unfold unevenly rather than insisting on immediate integration. The self is no longer treated as a project that must be perfected, but as a site of ongoing negotiation.

Second, gentleness toward others. If symbols are compressions shaped by position, history, and constraint, then disagreement is not an anomaly but a predictable feature of shared life. Waking does not require suspending judgment or abandoning boundaries, but it does require resisting the impulse to treat divergence as defect. Others are not obstacles to clarity; they are carriers of different encounters with the same reality. Gentleness means approaching disagreement with curiosity rather than conquest, and critique with an awareness of the costs imposed by one's own frameworks. It does not guarantee harmony, but it reduces the likelihood that conflict will escalate into dehumanization.

Third, gentleness toward reality itself. Much symbolic rigidity stems from an adversarial posture toward the world; our sense that reality ought to be intelligible on our terms, predictable within our models, and responsive to our intentions. When it is not, frustration quickly hardens into resentment. Waking involves abandoning this demand. It treats surprise not as betrayal but as information, and resistance not as hostility but as constraint. This does not romanticize difficulty, nor does it counsel passivity. It simply recognizes that reality does not owe us legibility, and that insisting otherwise generates unnecessary friction.

In practice, waking means allowing symbols to fail without panic. Panic is what turns provisional breakdown into permanent rupture. When a concept no longer works, panic demands immediate replacement, often with something more rigid and less responsive. Gentleness allows failure to be informative. It creates space to ask what has changed, what the symbol was doing before, and why it no longer fits. Failure becomes a point of learning rather than a verdict on the adequacy of thought itself.

It also means revising without humiliation. Revision is frequently resisted because it is experienced as loss of status or identity. To revise a belief feels like admitting error, and error

is too often treated as a moral failing rather than as a normal feature of navigation under constraint. Waking reframes revision as maintenance. Just as tools are adjusted over time to remain useful, symbolic frameworks must be recalibrated to remain viable. There is no disgrace in this; there is only the ongoing work of adaptation.

Finally, waking involves letting understanding deepen without demanding finality. Depth, in this context, is not the accumulation of ultimate answers but the refinement of sensitivity to friction, context, and the limits of one's own perspective. Understanding deepens when it becomes more responsive, not when it becomes more complete. Demanding finality freezes this process. It turns insight into doctrine and curiosity into defense. Gentleness resists this freeze, allowing understanding to remain open-ended without dissolving into vagueness.

The orientation described here does not require withdrawal from ordinary life, nor does it depend on rarefied intellectual achievement. It is enacted in small decisions. How quickly we assert certainty, how we respond to being wrong, and how we listen when another's symbols do not align with our own. These moments accumulate. Over time, they shape our way of inhabiting symbols that is less brittle, less punitive, and more capable of responding to change without collapse.

Learning to wake gently does not promise comfort. It offers something subtler, a reduction in unnecessary strain. It does not eliminate confusion, but it prevents confusion from turning into hostility toward oneself, others, or the world. In this sense, gentleness is not an aesthetic preference but a practical strategy for living within the limits of symbolic cognition.

It is tempting, at the end of a philosophical inquiry, to reach for a grand synthesis and to reassure oneself that the difficulties explored have been resolved, or that a clearer path now lies ahead. This essay resists that impulse. Its conclusions are intentionally restrained, because the conditions it has examined do not admit of final resolution. We are not masters of reality, standing above it with comprehensive understanding. Neither are we lost within it, abandoned to confusion or illusion. We are participants, finite, situated, and partial, moving within a world that exceeds us, and leaving traces as we go.

To think of ourselves this way is to adopt a humbler image of cognition. We are not constructing a definitive map of reality, nor are we wandering aimlessly without orientation.

We are leaving notes. These notes take many forms, concepts, stories, theories, practices, warnings, and invitations. They are written from particular positions, under particular constraints, and with particular hopes. They are not meant to be definitive. They are meant to be useful, to help someone else, perhaps ourselves at a later time, find their way back to a similar place with less friction.

The hope that animates this image is modest; it does not aspire to universal agreement or permanent clarity. Instead, it seeks a gradual reduction in the violence of misunderstanding; fewer moments in which difference is treated as threat and fewer instances in which symbolic failure escalates into moral condemnation. It hopes for less rigidity in certainty, a greater willingness to let symbols bend without breaking, and a recognition that symbols need not be absolute to be meaningful. It hopes for less friction in returning; less cost when we revisit old questions, revise old beliefs, or re-enter familiar terrain with new eyes.

None of this requires asceticism. It requires attention. Attention to where our symbols strain, to where they harm, and to where they help us move. Attention to the fact that others are navigating under different constraints, and that their notes may not resemble ours. Attention to the limits that shape all understanding, including our own.

If there is calm to be found here, it does not come from reassurance that everything will make sense in the end. It comes from humility, from seeing clearly what symbols can and cannot do, and from aligning our expectations accordingly. Calm arises when we stop demanding that cognition deliver what it was never designed to provide, and begin to appreciate what it already does, imperfectly but indispensably.

We leave better notes not by claiming authority over reality, but by acknowledging our place within it. We do so when we write, speak, and act in ways that reduce friction rather than amplify it, that invite return rather than enforce conclusion. This is not an ending. It is a way of continuing, awake enough to notice the dream, and gentle enough to keep moving within it.

References

James, B. (2025). Beyond AGI: Intelligence as a Coherence-Regulating, Open-Ended Evolutionary Process. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMBAI-2

James, B. (2025). Beyond Shannon: Coherence Information Theory and the Future of Communication. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMBSC

James, B. (2025). The problem Jacques Lacan named, and the one he could not see. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTPJ

James, B. (2025). Reality Against the Symbolic; the Structural Struggle of Humanity and Entropy. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMRAT-6

James, B. (2025). Reality's Experiment: Neurotypical Lock-in, Neurodivergent Disruption. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMREN

James, B. (2025). Symbolic improvisation; the coherence of language. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMSIT-2

James, B. (2025). The Symbolic Lock-in of the Self; Reality's Struggle to Understand and Remember Itself. PhilPapers. https://philpapers.org/rec/JAMTSL-4